

## REMARKS

A request for a one-month extension of the shortened statutory period to reply to the Office Action of April 7, 2009, is submitted herewith.

In this Amendment, applicants have cancelled claim 19. With the cancellation of claim 19, the objection to the drawings due to the absence of an illustration of the subject matter of that claim is believed to have been rendered moot. Consequently, no drawing change is now believed to be required, and none is submitted. Applicants request the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In this Amendment, applicants have amended independent claims 14, 23, 26 to reflect a feature of the peg 9' as illustrated in Fig 3. As shown in Fig 3, the peg 9', which is integrally unitary with the module support 8', has a distal end that is chamfered to a narrowing taper or bevel that is of reduced diameter as compared to the rest of the peg. This feature is not disclosed in any of the prior art of record. This feature has the advantage of speeding the assembly of the window-lifting rail onto the module support since the reduced diameter end portion acts as a self-centering mechanism with pushing the window-lifting rail recess onto the peg. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have arrived at this feature from the prior art of record.

Samways et al. shows a fairly complex structure of a separate shell bearing 15 mechanically coupled to the rail or guide bar 6. A separate threaded fastener 16 passes through the interior of the shell bearing 15 to engage alignment bushing 17 so as to secure the support module 1 to the rail or guide bar 6. Samways et al. does not disclose the deflection roller supporting outward formation being formed integrally unitary with the rail or the peg being formed integrally unitary with the module support. Were one to attempt to form a peg, which is integrally unitary with the module support in accordance with Samways et al., the outer or distal end of the peg would likely reflect the

radially projecting flange present on the shell bearing 15 of Samways et al. Even if one were motivated to reduce the radially projecting flange, one would not be led to a distal end that is chamfered to a narrowing taper or bevel that is of reduced diameter as compared to the rest of the peg as now required by the independent claim of the present application.

Klitzsch et al. discloses a deflection roller installation that includes a window-lifting rail 10 having an integrally unitary outward formation 16, shown in Fig 8a, that receives a deflection roller 18 as shown in Figs 8b, 9 and 10. Again, were one motivated to attempt to form a peg, which is integrally unitary with the module support in accordance with Klitzsch et al., none of the figures of Klitzsch et al. would suggest to one of ordinary skill for form the peg with a distal end that is chamfered to a narrowing taper or bevel that is of reduced diameter as compared to the rest of the peg as now required by the independent claim of the present application.

The remaining references of record are directed to the selection of materials or other features addressed in dependent claims, rather than the structural features identified and claimed in the independent claims of the present application, and thus have only marginal relevancy to the patentability of the independent claims. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the independent claims, as amended, in view of the forgoing remarks.

With the forgoing changes to the claims, applicants submit that the present application is placed in condition for allowance.

The subscribing attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview should the Examiner believe that an additional recitation is needed to place any of the pending claims in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



A. James Richardson  
Reg. No. 26,983

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
Customer No. 27879  
Telephone: (317) 636-0886  
Fax: (317) 634-6701